

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1 and 3-37 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection in view of the remarks as set forth below.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is noted that in the Office Action of June 14, 2006, claims 2-19 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant rewrote claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2 so that these claims should have been allowable. It is noted the Examiner now rejects these claims. Applicant submits that these claims remain allowable as indicated previously.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-29 and 31-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Amstrad (1998) in view of Fado et al. (U.S. Patent 6,016,136) and further in view of Klopfenstein et al. (U.S. Patent 6,985,190) and Vaidyanathan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,467,081). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Amstrad discloses a method for implementing a help function in a digital television receiver with a plurality of buttons including a help button and cursor buttons. The Examiner admits that this reference does not show the method steps of displaying the main help items, indicating one of the title of the external elements with the cursor and displaying the help description of the indicated one on the third area of the screen.

The Examiner relies on Fado et al. to show help items including titles of external elements on a first area of the screen when the user pushes the help button. The Examiner feels that it would have been obvious to combine the external configuration information of Fado et al. with the help function of Amstrad to make it easier for the user to follow the set up instructions. The Examiner admits that the combination of Amstrad and Fado et al. do not disclose a plurality of titles. The Examiner relies on Klopfenstein et al. to show a plurality of titles.

The Examiner admits that the combination of Amstrad, Fado et al. and Klopfenstein et al. does not disclose displaying the help without a separate key signal when the cursor indicates one part of the configuration of the display element. The Examiner relies on Klopfenstein et al. to teach the concept of hovering the cursor to indicate the part of the configuration.

First, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not met his burden of showing the obviousness of combining the claims and in particular does not show any motivation for making such a combination. Applicant submits there is no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the limitations of the three secondary references to Amstrad without hindsight. Thus, the Examiner merely states it would have been obvious to add the teachings of Fado et al. to make it easier for the user to follow the instructions. Applicant submits that this is not sufficient motivation. This may be the result of the combination, but there is no motivation given why one should seek out information such as taught in Fado et al. to be combined with Amstrad.

Likewise, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to add the feature of the plurality of titles of Klopfenstein et al. The Examiner states that the user would have a more condensed menu system. Again, this may be the result, but is not a motivation why one would look to Klopfenstein et al. for such a feature. In a similar fashion, there is no motivation to use the

Vaidyanathan et al. concept of hovering. The Examiner merely states that this would enable the user to view the help without any more interaction. However, there is no motivation as to why one would look to Vaidyanathan et al. after combining the other three references.

Should the Examiner continue this rejection, he is requested to explain where any motivation is found for making such a combination and why one would look to the other three references after reviewing the method of Amstrad. Applicant submits that any such motivation which is shown should rely on a teaching either of the references themselves or from some other source, but should not merely be a statement of the result of the combination.

Applicant submits that there are a number of other deficiencies within the references and how they are presented by the Examiner. First, the Amstrad reference does show a television receiver which has a remote control with a plurality of buttons including a held button and cursor buttons as indicated on page 3. However, Applicant is unable to locate in this lengthy document any statement as to the workings of a help button beyond this one single small description. In fact, the entire statement is for "help on using the sky guide". Accordingly, this reference only shows the use of a help button and cursor button. Thus, it does not show any part of the method.

The Examiner has cited the Fado et al. reference to show that the help items can show titles of external elements such as a headphone jack and an external headset speaker. The Examiner refers to Figure 7. First, Applicant notes that this is not a television situation, but for set up instructions for microphones in a computer. While a help button is shown in Figure 7, the display on the screen has nothing to do with the help button and is instead a set of instructions for connecting the microphone and speakers. In fact, when the Examiner describes the user pushing the help button, he states "such as 'next' ". Thus, the Examiner is trying to equate the

next button with the help button. It is not understood why the Examiner is referring to the next button since there is a separate help button. The use of a next button is completely different from that of a help button and is mainly designed to advance to the following instruction. Applicant does not understand how the Examiner can utilize this teaching to show this feature. To the extent that the display represents a help button, it still only shows a single part of the screen rather than three different areas on the screen. Applicant submits that Fado et al. does not teach the part of the invention suggested by the Examiner and that the teachings of Fado et al. do not aid the Amstrad reference to overcome its deficiencies. Accordingly, it is not understood how these two inventions can be combined since Amstrad does not teach how the help button is used and neither does Fado et al. At best, the combination of these two references merely show the use of a help button without any explanation as to what it shows.

The Examiner describes the Klopfenstein et al. reference to show that there is a plurality of titles in Figure 6. The Klopfenstein et al. reference only shows a plurality of menu items/programs/functions 50 (column 4, line 9). While Klopfenstein et al. does show that a menu can include more than one listing, there is no teaching of any further relevant features. The device does not include a help button. A help display is noted at item 48. This is on the screen and can be activated by a cursor rather than being a button.

Accordingly, it is not clear how this help indication works or what would result when it is activated. Applicant submits that the feature of having multiple titles in a listing does not aid the Amstrad and Fado et al. references in teaching the presently claimed invention.

The Examiner also relies on Vaidyanathan et al. to teach the idea of displaying information by hovering. First, again it is noted that this reference does not refer to a television

receiver, but rather a computer. Further, even if this reference does teach the concept of hovering to display information, it does not teach any other features of the invention and accordingly cannot aid the other three references in overcoming their deficiencies.

Applicant especially notes that none of these references teach the concept of having different areas of the screen for displaying the titles of external elements for detailed configurations and help descriptions as described in claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that even if the references are combined, they still do not teach all of the features of the presently claimed invention. In view of this, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not obvious over the combination of these four references.

Claims 3-19 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features that make them additionally allowable. These features include the use of various buttons to cause various information in the different areas to appear or disappear on the screen. This is also not shown in the references. Other claims describe the arrangement of the buttons and the arrangement of the various areas on the screen. Accordingly, these claims are all considered to be allowable.

Independent claim 20 is similar to claim 1 but does not include the indicating step of claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 20 remains allowable since the references still do not show the use of the help button in the manner described in the claim. Applicant further submits that claim 20 is allowable since the Examiner has not met his burden of showing motivation for combining the four references. Further, none of the references teach the concept of multiple areas on the screen as described above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 20 is also allowable.

Claims 21-37 depend from claim 20 and as such are also considered to be allowable. Further, each of these claims recite other features that make them additionally allowable.

Claims 12 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Amstrad in view of Fado et al. and further in view of Klopfenstein et al., Vaidyanathan et al. and further in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent 5,933,157). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Anderson to teach the idea that the main help items are displayed when the help button is pushed and these main help items disappear when the user releases the help button. Applicant submits that even if this reference does teach this feature, these claims remain allowable based upon their dependency from allowable independent claim.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not met his of showing some motivation for combining all five references. Accordingly, this rejection is also overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse, Reg. No. 27,295 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No. 10/020,162
Amendment dated June 26, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2007

Docket No.: 0465-0885P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

 BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant